

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed April 13, 2010. Claims 1-8, 14 and 16-17 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. In view of the amendments above and the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-8, 14 and 16-17

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 14, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003 / 0142047 (“Inoue”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1-8, 14 and 16-17 are allowable

Independent Claim 1 has been amended herein to better define Applicant’s invention over Inoue. Claim 1 now recites limitations and/or features which are not disclosed by Inoue. In particular, claim 2 is herewith cancelled, without prejudice, and claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of now-cancelled claim 2. It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over Inoue for at least the following reasons.

The cited portions of Inoue do not anticipate claim 1, as herewith amended, because the cited portions of Inoue do not teach every element of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Inoue do not disclose or suggest, *“wherein power is provided to each pixel from a first power line (26), and wherein one of the light dependent device and the storage capacitor is coupled to a second power supply line (50), and wherein the device further comprises means for varying the voltage on the second power supply line (50) during a pixel illumination period, and wherein the voltage on the second power supply line (50) is ramped during a pixel illumination period”*, as recited in claim 1. [Emphasis Added]

In the Office Action, it is suggested that the Inoue reference teaches wherein the voltage on the second power supply line (551) is ramped during a pixel illumination period. The Office refers the applicants to Inoue, Figs. 5 and 6, item 551, C and E. Applicants

respectfully disagree. Fig. 6 of Inoue is a waveform diagram showing the operating sequence of the pixel driving circuit according to one embodiment. In FIG. 6 of Inoue, a waveform A denotes a first vertical scanning signal, a waveform B denotes a first horizontal scanning signal, **a waveform C denotes a vertical scanning signal for correction**, a waveform D denotes a gate voltage of the second transistor, **a waveform E denotes a light emission intensity of the organic EL element**, and a waveform F denotes a voltage of a node Z.

Applicants respectfully note that that signal C in Fig. 6 of Inoue only changes within **the line period defined by trace A and B**. In contrast to Inoue, Claim 1, as herewith amended, recites that the voltage is varied **during the pixel illumination period**. Claim 1, as herewith amended, recites in part,*wherein the device further comprises means for varying the voltage on the second power supply line (50) during a pixel illumination period....*” Where the pixel illumination period is synonymous with the field period. It is respectfully submitted that the pixel illumination period (i.e., field period) of the invention is different from the line period as taught in Inoue.

In further contrast to Inoue, claim 1, has been herewith amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, and recites in relevant part that ***the voltage on the second power supply line (50) is ramped during a pixel illumination period***”. It is respectfully submitted that Inoue does not illustrate, teach or suggest a ramped signal applied to the second power supply line (551). Instead, Inoue merely illustrates that all signalling occurs between two values. See Inoue, Fig. 5. Inoue discloses at par. 73, in a timing T4 of FIG. 6, when the vertical scanning line 551 for correction is activated in response to the vertical scanning line signal for correction (waveform C), the fifth transistor 554 for correction and the six transistor 35 are conducted at the same time. The Office further cites waveform E of Inoue for allegedly teaching the means for varying the voltage on the second power supply line (551) during a pixel illumination period. However, waveform E does not represent an activation signal. Instead, waveform E merely denotes a light emission intensity of the organic EL element. Hence claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 2-8 and 14 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Independent Claim 16 recites similar subject matter as Independent Claim 1 and therefore contains the limitations of Claim 1. Hence, for at least the same reasons given for Claim 1, Claim 16 is believed to recite statutory subject matter under 35 USC 102(b). Claim 17 depends from independent Claim 16, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claim 17 is also allowable, at least by virtue of its respective dependency from Claim 16.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-8, 14, 16-17 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Mike Belk, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-945-6000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Scaturro
Reg. No. 51,356
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, Previously Presented York 10510-8001